



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/673,108  | 09/26/2003  | Jeffrey A. Moster    | 8266-1148           | 9838             |
| 7590  | 08/19/2005  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Intellectual Property Group<br>Bose McKinney & Evans LLP<br>2700 First Indiana Plaza<br>135 North Pennsylvania Street<br>Indianapolis, IN 46204 |             |                      | TRETEL, MICHAEL     |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 3673                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/673,108             | MOSTER ET AL.       |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Michael Trettel        | 3673                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2,12-15 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/26/03</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 to 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 60 of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,132. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims set forth a subset of the previously claimed subject matter arranged into a differing format. Since the same basic subject matter is set forth this is considered to be within the ordinary level of skill in the art. The claims also set forth a method of assembling the previously claimed article, which is clearly within the ordinary level of skill in the art and therefore is regarded as being obvious.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 11, and 16 to 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marra, Jr (US 5,175,897). Marra, Jr. shows padded covers 40, 42 used to cover siderails 14, 16 of a hospital bed 10. The side rails 14, 16 are of a known and conventional configuration which include at least two housings 32, 34 that have controls for adjusting the bed and/or communications equipment such as a telephone or intercom. The examiner notes that it is well known in the art to include an intercom with a speaker assembly within a siderail, and to also include control switches for operation of the bed's features. The cover 42 includes at least two apertures 80, 82 that overlay and allow access to the housings 32, 34. Each aperture can be covered with a flexible cover flap 86 made of a transparent material that allows access to the controls of the housing. The cover flap can be permanently attached to the cover (column 6, line 11) in which case it serves to seal and/or protect the equipment housing from water and fluids. The transparent cover flap 86 overlays and protects the equipment housings 32, 34, and therefore overlays and protects any switches and speakers included as part of the housing.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 to 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marra, Jr (US 5,175,897). In column 5, lines 1 to 25 of the Marra patent it is disclosed that the cover can be made from a variety of natural and/or synthetic materials, and that it can also be washed throughout numerous cleaning cycles. The examiner submits that it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to have used a polyester material to make the Marra cover, and that it would have been further obvious to have used a material within the range of thicknesses claimed to make the transparent cover flap 86. Claims 7 to 9 would appear to be no more than an obvious method of cleaning the cover between use by a differing patient.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2, 12 to 15, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hamilton et al, Kramer et al, and Drew et al show speaker housings attached to a component of a bed which are of particular interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Trettel whose telephone number is (571) 272-7052. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday from 7.30 am to 5.00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford, can be reached on (571) 272-7052. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



Michael Trettel  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3673